

invention differs from Cannon by providing a specific type of output not taught by Cannon or any of the other cited references. This output comprises age-event information, defined in the specification as

“information in the age-event database. This information typically comprises a record of a database, which contains the name of an individual, an event that occurred in the life of that individual, and the age (or information sufficient to calculate the age) of that individual at the time of that event. In some embodiments, two connected databases—one containing name and event information, and one containing name and age information—are used.”

The term, “age-event database” is further defined in the specification:

“The age-event database contains information about events in the lives of individuals (potentially including famous individuals, fictional characters, and/or individuals known to a user), where each event can be correlated to the age of the individual or individuals involved in the event.”

The specification contains multiple examples of the use of the term age-event information in this context. As the patentee is permitted to be his own lexicographer (See Hormone Research Foundation Inc. v. Genentech Inc., 904 F.2d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1990)), the definition in the specification applies to the claim. The examiner appears to be misinterpreting a birthday of the target individual (as described in Cannon) as an age-event. The age-events described in the present invention are not events that occur in the life of the target individual. The output of the present invention as claimed in Claim 1 represents information about one or more defined events that occurred while a *second* individual involved in that event was at the input age, as compared with Cannon, in which the output represents a tangible greeting card that may contain an age. Thus, the prior art of Cannon is inapposite to the present invention, either in the context of anticipation or obviousness.

**Claims 1, 3-9, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected as anticipated under 35 USC 102 on the basis of Cannon.**

*Claim 1. A computer-implemented method for providing a user with age-event information comprising:*

- a) receiving an input signal comprising age information; and*
- b) providing an output signal comprising age-event information corresponding to said age information.*

Claim 1 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, which teaches the input of “several data set items” and the output of a tangible greeting card that may include age information that was received as input. While Cannon and the other cited references do include an input signal comprising age information, the present invention differs from Cannon by providing a specific type of output not taught by Cannon or any of the other cited references. This output comprises age-event information, defined in the specification as

“information in the age-event database. This information typically comprises a record of a database, which contains the name of an individual, an event that occurred in the life of that individual, and the age (or information sufficient to calculate the age) of that individual at the time of that event. In some embodiments, two connected databases—one containing name and event information, and one containing name and age information—are used.”

The term, “age-event database” is further defined in the specification:

“The age-event database contains information about events in the lives of individuals (potentially including famous individuals, fictional characters, and/or individuals known

to a user), where each event can be correlated to the age of the individual or individuals involved in the event.”

The specification contains multiple examples of the use of the term age-event information in this context. As the patentee is permitted to be his own lexicographer (See Hormone Research Foundation Inc. v. Genentech Inc., 904 F.2d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1990)), the definition in the specification applies to the claim. The examiner appears to be misinterpreting a birthday of the target individual as an age-event. The age-events described in the present invention are not events that occur in the life of the target individual. The output of the present invention as claimed in Claim 1 represents information about one or more defined events that occurred while a *second* individual involved in that event was at the input age, as compared with Cannon, in which the output represents a tangible greeting card that may contain an age. Thus, the prior art of Cannon is inapposite to Claim 1.

*Claim 3. The method of Claim 1, wherein the input signal comprises age information relating to a target individual, and the output signal comprises age-event information customized for said target individual.*

Claim 3, which is dependent on Claim 1, is rejected on similar grounds. Cannon teaches an input signal that may include an age (i.e., “a birthday card for his two-year old son”), and an output signal that includes an age and information about “special occasion parameters input by the customer.” In the present invention, the user is not required to provide information regarding “special occasion parameters.” Moreover, the output signal of the present invention comprises “age-event information”, which clearly is not taught or anticipated by Cannon.

*Claim 4. The method of Claim 3, wherein the output signal further comprises a date, and the age event information customized for said target individual comprises information*

*about an event in the life of an age-event individual when the age-event individual was the same age as the target individual on said date.*

Claim 4, which is dependent on Claim 3, is also rejected on the basis of Cannon. Cannon teaches that a “display query requests that the customer enter age data.” Entry of age data is completely different from an output signal comprising a date, as the statement cited from Cannon refers to the input of age, while the statement in the claim refers to output (not input) and refers to a specific date, rather than an age. Further, Cannon teaches only the use of “special occasion parameters” such as “‘birthday,’ ‘son’ and ‘two-year olds’” to define a birthday card for a two-year old son (i.e., the target individual). This is completely different from “age-event information customized for said target individual comprises information about an event in the life of an age-event individual when the age-event individual was the same age as the target individual on said date,” which refers to an event in the life of second individual (designated the age-event individual), and which is completely unpredictable by a user from the input.

*Claim 5. The method of claim 1, wherein the input signal comprises a birthdate.*

Claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, is also rejected on the basis of Cannon. While Cannon and the present invention both accept input signals that comprise ages, the fundamental difference between the present invention and Cannon is recited in the earlier claims, including Claim 1, on which Claim 5 is dependent. Moreover, the cited passage from Cannon teaches the input of “a specific age 238, or input ‘age unknown’ 240”, but not a birthdate.

*Claim 6. The method of claim 1, wherein the input signal comprises an age in years.*

Claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, is also rejected on the basis of Cannon. While Cannon and the present invention both accept input signals that comprise ages (and by extension, birthdates), the fundamental difference between the present invention and

Cannon is recited in the earlier claims, including Claim 1, on which Claim 6 is dependent.

*Claim 7. The method of claim 1, wherein the output signal is obtained by comparing the input signal to an age-event database, and selecting at least one item from the age-event database that corresponds to an age that derives from said inputted age information.*

Claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, is also rejected on the basis of Cannon. While Cannon teaches the lookup in a database, using an age and special occasion parameters as input, to find card designs that correspond to that age, these card designs do not include age-event information. Thus, according to the definitions in the specification, the database in Cannon is not an age-event database, which “refers to a database, or a set of two or more related databases, containing age-event information.”

*Claim 8. The method of claim 4, further comprising the step of generating a customized greeting for the target individual.*

Claim 8 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, which teaches the generation of a customized greeting for a target individual. However, claim 8 is patentable for the same reasons that claims 1 and 4 are, as discussed above.

*Claim 9. The method of claim 8, wherein the customized greeting is an electronic greeting card.*

Claim 9 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, which allows for the remote transfer of data regarding card sales, machine performance, trouble or other data. However, claim 9 is patentable for the same reasons that claims 1, 4 and 8 are, as discussed above. Moreover, Cannon does not teach the production of a greeting card in electronic form.

*Claim 12. The method of claim 3, further comprising the step of generating a life-chart for the target individual, wherein said life-chart comprises age-events related to at least about one year of the life of the target individual.*

Claim 12 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, based on figures 4, 5, 5a, and 12. These figures in Cannon include flowcharts describing the generation of a tangible greeting card that contains age and special occasion parameter information, and a diagram that describes the input of age information. None of these figures teach the generation of a life-chart comprising age-events related to any period of time in the life of a target individual.

*Claim 14. A computer system for providing age-event information, comprising:*

*computer processor means for processing data;*

*storage means for storing data on a storage medium;*

*means for receiving age information input; and*

*means, responsive to said receiving means, for outputting age-event information to a user.*

Claim 14 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, which includes a description of a computer with storage means, input means, and display means. The means described in the claim refer to specific means that implement the invention, rather than to a generic computer system. Specifically, these include means to receive age information input, and to output age-event information to a user in response to that input.

*Claim 16. The computer system of claim 14, further comprising means for generating a customized greeting from the user to a target.*

Claim 16 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, which teaches generation of customized greetings. However, Claim 16 is patentable for the reasons recited above for claim 14.

*Claim 18. A computer memory storage device encoded with a computer program for using a computer system to provide age-event information, comprising*

*means for inputting age information; and*  
*means for providing age-event information as output.*

Claim 18 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, which describes a computer program that enables a search for a birthday card for a target individual of a specified age. However, this birthday card does not contain age-event information as defined in the specification. Please see the discussion of Claim 1 for a more detailed explanation of age-event information.

*Claim 19. The computer memory storage device of claim 18, further comprising means for generating a customized greeting.*

Claim 19 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, which describes means for generating customized greetings. However, Claim 19 is patentable for the same reasons that claim 18 is.

**Claims 2,13,15, 21, and 22 are rejected as obvious on the basis of Cannon, in view of Simpson.**

*Claim 2. The method of claim 1, wherein the input signal comprises a date, and the output signal comprises a celebrity ageliner.*

As defined in the specification, an “ageliner” “refers to a statement comparing a first person’s age on a given date to an age of an age-event individual when a notable event in

the age-event individual's life occurred." An "age-event individual" "refers to an individual whose name is associated with an event in the age-event database." As further discussed in the specification at page 12, an example of a "celebrity ageliner," where Bill Clinton is the celebrity, and Rutherford B. Hayes is the age-event individual, is "Today, Bill Clinton is exactly as old as when Rutherford B. Hayes won the 1876 Presidential election over Samuel Tilden, with a minority of the popular vote (19873 days, or 54 years and 4 months old)."

Thus, the examiner's assumption that "birth dates of famous people translates as celebrity ageliner" (Office Action at page 12), is incorrect. A "celebrity ageliner" is not taught by Simpson, which merely teaches providing "information on birth flowers, birth stones, famous people having birthdays during that particular month, famous events occurring during that month, and/or any other suitable information" (column 6, lines 32-40). Famous people's birthdays or events that occurred during a given month do not constitute a "celebrity ageliner", because people and events are not related in the context of the famous person's age, as is taught by the specification of the current invention.

*Claim 13 is the method of claim 3, further comprising the steps of generating a life-clock display for the target individual, wherein said life-clock display comprises a symbolic representation of the amount of life an individual has lived, and the amount of life an individual has remaining; and providing age-event information on said life-clock display.*

Claim 13 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, in view of Simpson. Simpson teaches modifying an output based on an input age, such that the output is modified depending on the input age.

Claim 13 is dependent on claim 3, which is in turn dependent on claim 1. For the reasons cited above, Cannon is irrelevant to a determination of the patentability of claims 1 and 3, and by extension, 13. Moreover, Simpson contains no description of anything resembling a life-clock, which requires simultaneous graphical representation both of



time lived and time yet to live. The fact that a user of Simpson might be able to separately determine some of the information that is presented on a life clock is irrelevant to the provision of a life clock in the context of the present invention. Moreover, Simpson does not address the additional limitations of claim 13, such as providing age-event information (as that term is used in the specification) on said life-clock display.

*Claim 15 is the computer system of Claim 14, further comprising means for generating a celebrity ageliner.*

Claim 15 is rejected on the basis of Cannon, in view of Simpson. This argument is based on the mistaken definition of "celebrity ageliner" used to reject claim 2. Claim 15 is valid for the same reasons that claim 2 is valid, as discussed above in connection with claim 2. Moreover, Claim 15 is patentable over Cannon for the same reasons that Claim 14 is, as described above in connection with claim 14.

*Claim 21 is the computer-implemented method for providing a user with age-event information of claim 1,*

*wherein the age information received in step a) corresponds to a first individual, and said method further comprises:*

*receiving an input signal comprising the name of a second individual;*

*wherein said output signal comprises at least one age-event related to said second individual.*

Claim 21 should be allowable for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In addition, the invention described by claim 21 involves receipt of age information regarding a first individual, the name of a second individual (normally a historical

figure), and provision of an output signal that comprises age-event information regarding the second individual in the context of the age information that is provided about the first individual. For example, a person might type in her own birthdate and the name of a historical figure, such as Napoleon Bonaparte, and would be presented with information regarding the dates on which she would be the same age that Napoleon Bonaparte was when important events occurred in his life. Simpson teaches receipt of information from a first individual that relates to a second individual to whom the first individual desires to present a gift, such that a gift may be customized for the second individual. Thus, Simpson's second individual, as the target of a gift, bears little relationship to the second individual of the invention, who is used solely to customize information of value to the first individual. The present invention does not specify any mechanism for selecting a gift appropriate for Napoleon Bonaparte. Moreover, the invention is not used to present a greeting card for the second individual, as appears to be assumed by the examiner (Office Action, page 17).

*Claim 22 is the computer implemented method for providing a user with age-event information of claim 21, wherein said output signal further comprises at least one date in the life of said first individual, wherein the age of said first individual on said date is the same as the age of said second individual at the time of said at least one age event.*

Claim 22 should be allowable for the same reasons that claims 1 and 21 are allowable.

Claim 22 is also rejected on the basis of Cannon by teaching of Simpson. In addition, while the Office Action (page 17) asserts that "Simpson teaches the output signal further comprises at least one date in the life of said first individual, wherein the age of said first individual on said date is the same as the age of said second individual at the time of said at least one age event (see column 2, lines 11-47)," nothing in the cited lines of Simpson (which are relevant to the purchase of a customized gift by a first person for a second person) has any relevance to a date in the life of one individual on which the age of that

individual is the same age as that of a second individual at the time of an age-event, as defined in the specification.

**Claims 10, 11, 17 and 20.**

Claims 10, 11, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon in view of Tackbary. Tackbary teaches the provision of greeting cards at kiosks and the production of customized calendars. These claims are all patentable for the same reasons that claims 1 (on which claims 10 and 11 indirectly depend), 14 (on which claim 17 depends), and 18 (on which claim 20 depends) are.

**Conclusion**

For all of the above reasons, the specification and claims are in proper form, and the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore, this application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

**Conditional request for constructive assistance**

Based on the arguments herein, the specification and claims of this application are proper, definite, and define novel subject matter which is also non-obvious. If, for any reason, this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, the constructive assistance and suggestions of the examiner pursuant to MPEP 2173.02 and 707.07 (j) are requested in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Philip R. Krause". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Philip" being more prominent and the last name "Krause" written in a continuous script.

Philip R. Krause  
Applicant Pro Se

9437 Seven Locks Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
(301)-365-8555  
fax: (301)-365-8555